

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful examination of the application and for the indication of allowable subject matter. However, in view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks that follow, the Examiner is respectfully urged to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

By the foregoing amendments, there are now sixteen claims and claims 1, 6, 7, and 12 are independent claims. New claims 12-16 are added by this amendment.

Information Disclosure Statement:

In accordance with the request by the Examiner, the Information Disclosure Statement filed on March 14, 2001 is resubmitted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to consider the information submitted therein.

Claims Objections:

Claim 6 has been amended as requested by the Examiner. Accordingly, the objection should be withdrawn.

Art Rejections:

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 10, and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0090721, hereinafter *Miura*. *Miura* discloses several embodiments throughout the specification and drawings. And, in making the current rejection, the Examiner has arbitrarily selected certain components from different embodiments and improperly allegedly combined them together to reject the present invention. However, Applicants submit that such piecemeal aggregation is not only inappropriate, but even if possible, it would not teach or suggest the present invention.

Specifically, the Examiner has combined the CPU 7 of the fourth embodiment (paragraph 55), which allegedly generates a signal based on an operation timing of the printing unit, and combines it with the multifunction peripheral device 51 of the sixth embodiment. The Examiner alleges that the CPU 7 of the fourth embodiment includes a timer which is started at a predetermined time and counts a clock signal which reads on a signal generator that generates a signal based on an operation timing of the printing unit. However, the timing discussed in paragraph 55 of *Miura* does not relate to an operation of the printer. Instead, the timing relates to whether or not the system of the fourth embodiment should be switched from the first printer 1 to the second printer 2. The Examiner further alleges that the discussion in paragraph 58 relates to switching the bus between transmission from the image reader to the external computer and transmission from the external computer to the printing unit. However, paragraph 58 again relates to switching the path so that the second printer 2 is used instead of the first printer 1, or vice versa. It does not relate to switching the bus between transmission from the image reader to the external computer and transmission from the external computer to the printing unit. Although *Miura* does disclose in paragraph 78 that image data generated by the scanner unit 52 of the MFP device 51 can be sent to the personal computer 71, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Miura* of a switching means that, in response to a signal generated by a signal generator based on an operation timing of the printing unit, switches the bus between transmission from the image reader to the external computer and transmission from the external computer to the printing unit. In fact, *Miura* does not disclose any details of traffic control within the bus line 61.

Furthermore, claim 1 is not obvious over *Miura* because, among other things, the determining function and the path state switching function of the CPU 7 from the fourth embodiment have no relation to the timer of the sixth embodiment.

The CPU 7 referred to by the Examiner is an element of the fourth embodiment, and has no relation to the image reader. Even though the functions of CPU 7 are applicable to CPU 58 of the sixth embodiment, this merely means that the CPU 58 can select whether the personal computer 71 is connected to the printer unit 53 of the MFP device 51 or the second printer 72.

Thus, independent claim 1 cannot be anticipated nor obvious over *Miura*. Claim 7 is a method version of claim 1, and is thus patentable over *Miura* at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 10 and 11 based on *Miura*.

Claims 2 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Miura* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,480,968, hereinafter *Tsuzuki*. the Examiner relies upon *Tsuzuki* for an alleged specific disclosure of a pixel corresponding clock signal. However, *Tsuzuki* does not otherwise overcome the deficiency of the independent claims from which claims 2 and 8 depend. Accordingly, claims 2 and 8 are also patentable over the applied prior art.

Claims 3 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Miura* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,742,317, hereinafter *Kashihara*. The Examiner appears to be relying on *Kashihara* for its alleged teaching that each time the horizontal sync signal BD is received, the printer controller transmits VDO signals of an amount corresponding to one line of the main scan synchronously with

the image clock signal VCLK which is sent from the signal processing circuit.

However, this disclosure does not overcome the deficiency of the rejection of the independent claims from which claims 3 and 9 depend. Accordingly, claims 3 and 9 are also patentable over the applied prior art.

The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claim 6 is patentable.

To further define the protection to which Applicants are entitled, new claims 12-16 are submitted herewith. New claim 12 defines a controller for controlling transmissions of image data between a digital copying machine and an external computer. The applied prior art also does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 12.

Claims 13-16 depend from claim 12, and are thus also patentable over the applied prior art.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this amendment, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: 10-27-0Y

By: William C. Rowland
William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620